UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,375	07/21/2003	Michael V. Sliger	13768.783.116	5139

47973   7590   03/20/2008
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
WEI, ZHENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 November 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,9 and 11-33* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-6,8,9 and 11-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Remarks

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since

this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous

Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's

submission filed on 11/02/2007 has been entered.

2.   This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 11/02/2007.

3.   Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11 have been amended.

4.   Claims 7, 10 and 34 have been cancelled.

5.   The 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph rejection to claims 1-34 is withdrawn in view

Applicant's arguments and further explanation.

6.   Claims 1-6, 8-9 and 11-33 remain pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/02/2007 have been fully considered:

▪   At page 11-12, section "Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101", the

Applicant submits that claims 24-25 and 29-33 recite statutory subject matter

and thus are statutory according M.P.E.P. §2106.01 (I).

However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As the Applicant cited in claim 24, the data structure only comprises "a first

set of data" and "a second set of data". These sets of data are merely amount

to data structure per se without any functional interrelationship with computer

software and hardware and thus are considered as nonfunctional descriptive

material. Therefore, said data structure is not a process, machine,

manufacture, or composition of matter and thus is not statutory according to

M.P.E.P. 2106.01 (II)

▪ At page 12, section "Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102", the Applicant

submits that <u>Zan</u> fails to teach "processing the source files into a base file

based upon package size" and other limitations as amended. *However, the*

Applicant's amendment changes the scope of claims and thus a new ground

of rejection is applied. See Draper (US 6,604,236 – now as part of record)

and Crudele (US 2002/0099726, now as part of record)

▪ At page 12, the Applicant also points out that "selecting a source file as base

file" was not recited in claim 1. *The Examiner's position is that "selecting a*

source file as base file" is how Zan would teach the equivalent limitation

"synthesizing a base file" as previous recited in claim 1.

▪ At page 14, last paragraph, the Applicant also points out that Zan and Sliger

fail to teach or suggest synthesizing a target file by applying a delta included

in the package to the at least one base file included in the package. However,

the Examiner's position is that, it is well known in the computer art that a

delta file has to be applied to the old version (base file) file to generate a new

version (target file), also as <u>Sliger</u> disclosed (see for example, col.2, lines 16-

20). Therefore it is obvious that the delta file and base file have to work

together either in the same package or being transferring to the same location

as <u>Sliger</u> disclosed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
conditions and requirements of this title.

9.   Claims 24-25 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 24-25 and 29-33:

Claims 24-25 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because those claims

refer to a computer-readable medium having only stored thereon a data structure

(data structure Per Se.), which is **nonfunctional descriptive material**.

According to MPEP, chapter **2106 Patentable Subject Matter - Computer-**

Related Inventions [R-3], IV, 1, (b), descriptive material that cannot exhibit any

functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are

performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or

composition of matter and should be rejected under **35 U.S.C. 101**. Therefore,

the above claims are non-statutory. For further information, see MPEP (Latest

Revision August 2006), Chapter 2106 Patentable Subject Matter - Computer-

Related Inventions [R-3], IV. DETERMINE WHETHER THE CLAIMED

INVENTION COMPLIES WITH 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11, 12 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Zan (Zan et al, "Cluster-Based Delta Compression of a

Collection of Files") in view of Draper (US 6,604,236 *236 – now as part of record*)

in further view of Crudele (US 2002/0099726 *236 – now as part of record*)

Claim 1:

Zan discloses in a computing environment, a method comprising:

- receiving information corresponding to a plurality of source files (see for

  example, p.2, left column, lines 10-13, "obtaining optimal compression of a

  collection of n files");

- generating a list of prospective delta inputs, including an entry for each

  unique source file in the plurality of source files (see for example, p.3,

  section 2.1, "Given a collection of n files we construct a complete directed

  graph...where each node corresponds to a file...");

- processing the source files into a base file for a package based upon

  package size (file/node weight) (see for example, p.3 Fig.1, example of a

  directed and weighted complete graph; also see p.3, left column, last

paragraph to right column first paragraph about generating base file (file 1));

- generating a delta from the base file and source file (see for example, p.3, right column, first paragraph, "file2 and 3 are compressed by computing a delta with respect to file 1");

But Zan does not explicitly disclose cited limitations about calculating signature, saving file name, signatures and instructions in manifest file and packaging the base file and the delta into a self-contained package.

However, Draper in the same analogous art of delta compression discloses

- calculating signatures for each of the plurality of source files (see for example, Fig.3A step 125, "Generate checksum for file" and related text);

- generating instructions needed to perform an extraction (see for example, col.1, lines 52-60, "basis index table", "file of modification data blocks" and "delta lookup table" and related text)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Zan and Draper to generate compressed files including signature and instruction. One would have been motivated to do so to update the content of a copy of the original file system without having to generate a copy of every file and data block for the new content of the original file system as suggested by Draper (see for example, ABSTRACT, last paragraph)

But neither Zan nor Draper discloses saving the instructions, file name (entry

name) and signatures in a manifest and further packaging the manifest file, base

file and delta into a self-contained package. However, Crudele in the same

analogous art of distribution of file updates, discloses creating a software

package (see for example, paragraph [0013], [0025] "distribution package file)

with including a distribution package file, the delta distribution package file

comprising a delta file (see for example, paragraph [0025]) and signatures

(crc32) (see for example, paragraph [0025]). Crudele further discloses that this

package is created by administrator via graphic user interface (GUI). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use Crudele's method and its GUI to also include the

base file in the package for distribution. It is also obvious to save all the

information about instruction, signature and file name in a one manifest file

instead of separate file in the software package.

Claim 4:

Zan discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the first source file and the second

source file are not different versions of the same file. (see for example, Fig.1, and

related text, also see, p.3, left column, lines 8-15, "collection of files")

Claim 5:

Zan discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the first source file and the second

source file are not different language translations of the same file. (see for example, Fig.1, and related text, also see, p.3, left column, lines 8-15, "collection of files")

Claim 6:

Zan discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the first source file and the second source file are different language translations of the same file. (see for example, Fig.1, and related text, also see, p.3, left column, lines 8-15, "collection of files")

Claim 8:

Zan also discloses the method of claim 7 further comprising constructing a directed graph of file sizes based on multiple possible pairings of source files, and selecting the first source file based on information in the directed graph. (see for example, Fig.1 and related text, "edge" and "node")

Claim 11:

Zan also discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising, providing the package to a recipient, the recipient applying the delta to the first source file to synthesize the second source file (see for example, p.1, right column, lines 1-8, "sender and receiver both possess a reference file").

Claim 12, 24:

Claims 12 and 24 are computer product version for performing the claimed
method as in claim 1 addressed above, wherein all claimed limitation functions
have been addressed and/or set forth above and certainly it is well known in the
computer art to run and/or practice as such computer product which has its
computer-executable instructions stored on a computer-readable storage
medium so that this computer product would be executed by the computer
system to perform the method addressed in claim 1 above to realize its
functionality. Therefore, they also would have been obvious by Zan, Draper and
Crudele.

Claim 25:

Zan, Draper and Crudele disclose the data structure of claim 24 further
comprising a third set of data comprising another delta file (see for example, p.3,
right column, lines 1-5, "sequence for compression" about 4 pairwise delta
compressions). It is well known in the computer art to practice and store said
method in the computer-readable medium. Therefore, it is also obvious by Zan,
Draper and Crudele.

Claim 26-27:

Zan further discloses the data structure of claim 24 wherein the other delta is
configured to synthesize another target file when applied to the base/target file.

(see for example, p.2, left column, lines 36-38, "each target file is compressed

with respect to a single reference file" and also see p.3, right column, lines 1-5,

"sequence for compression" about different combinations of pairwise

compressions and also see related explanations). It is well known in the

computer art to practice and store said method in the computer-readable

medium. Therefore, it is also obvious by Zan.

Claim 28:

Zan further discloses the data structure of claim 24 further comprising

transmitting the data structure from a source to a client recipient (see for

example, p.1, right column, lines 1-8, "In a communication scenario, they typically

exploit the fact that the sender and receiver both possess a reference file that is

similar to the transmitted file."). It is well known in the computer art to practice

and store said method in the computer-readable medium. Therefore, it is also

obvious by Zan, Draper and Crudele.

12.   Claims 2, 29, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over by Zan, Draper and Crudele in view of Forbes (Forbes et al.,

US 6,381,742 B2).

Claim 2:

Zan, Draper and Crudele disclose the method as in claim 1 above, but do not

disclose the method further comprising, packaging data for directing a client

extractor to synthesize a target file corresponding to the second source file from

the base file and the delta. However, Forbes in the same analogous art of

software package management discloses a manifest file (package data) to

manage the installation, execution. (see for example, Fig.2A, element 207 and

related text. Also see abstract about the manifest file). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to include the manifest file into the software package to provide

configuration information to the software installation. One has motivation to do so

to automatically install software package without requiring manual intervention by

the user. (see for example, col.3, lines 30-34, "Because the manifest file contains

the location of the distribution units for any dependencies, the software package

manager can acquire and install the dependencies without requiring manual

intervention by the user.")

Claims 29, 32 and 33:

Zan, Draper and Crudele disclose the method as in claim 24 above, but does not

disclose the method further comprising a third set of data comprising data for

directing an extraction program. However, Forbes in the same analogous art of

software package management discloses a manifest file (package data) to

manage the installation, execution. (see for example, Fig.2A, element 207 and

related text. Also see abstract about the manifest file). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to include the manifest file into the software package to provide

configuration information to the software installation. One has motivation to do so

to automatically install software package without requiring manual intervention by

the user. (see for example, col.3, lines 30-34, "Because the manifest file contains

the location of the distribution units for any dependencies, the software package

manager can acquire and install the dependencies without requiring manual

intervention by the user.")

13.   Claims 3, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by

Zan, Draper and Crudele in view of Henry (Craig James Henry, US 6,131,192).

Claim 3:

Zan, Draper and Crudele disclose the method as in claim 1 above, but does not

disclose the method further comprising, setting at least one file name by which a

client extractor may synthesize a target file corresponding to the second source

file from the base file and the delta. However, Henry in the same analogous art of

software installation discloses a method for setting up the software product

name. (see for example, Fig.4B, steps 415-445 and related text). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to set the target file name for decompressed file. One has

motivation to do so to identify file to decompress and set right file name to further

installation and execution. (see for example, col.18, lines 26-32)

Claim 30:

by <u>Zan</u>, <u>Draper</u> and <u>Crudele</u> disclose the data structure of claim 24, but does not

disclose the data structure further comprising a third set of data comprising an

extraction program. However, <u>Henry</u> in the same analogous art of software

installation discloses the software package includes a setup program (extraction

program) and a compressed file. (see for example, col.1, lines 16-18). Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include the setup program in <u>Zan</u>'s invention. One has

motivation to do so to automatically perform the decompression process as once

suggested by <u>Henry</u> (see for example, col.1, lines 45-47, "processes

automatically")

14.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Zan</u> in

        view of <u>Weiss</u> (Mark Allen Weiss, "Data Structures & Algorithm Analysis in C++").

        Claim 9:

        <u>Zan</u> discloses the method as in claim 8 above wherein a branching B of a

        directed graph G does not contain a cycle, but does not disclose using minimum

        spanning tree or like algorithm to the directed graph to eliminate loop. However,

        <u>Weiss</u> in the same analogous art of eliminate loop in graph discloses a method of

        using minimum spanning tree. (see for example, p.356-362, "Prim's Algorithm"

        and "Kruskal's Algorithm"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

        ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use minimum

spanning tree algorithm to eliminate loop in <u>Zan</u>'s directed graph. One has

motivation to do so to prevent loop in <u>Zan</u>'s directed graph as once required by

<u>Zan</u> (see for example, p.3, left column, line 19, "B does not contain a cycle").

15.   Claims 13, 14, 15 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Zan</u> (Zan et al, "Cluster-Based Delta Compression of a

Collection of Files") in view of <u>Sliger</u> (Sliger et al., US 6,216,175)

Claim 13:

<u>Zan</u> discloses in a computing environment, a method to compress a collection of

files to generate a plurality of deltas and base files in a package, (see for

example, p.1, right column, lines 23-26, "using delta compression to better

compress large collections of file where it is not obvious at all how to efficiently

identify appropriate reference and target files"), but does not explicitly disclose

how to decompress them. However, <u>Sliger</u> in the same analogous art of software

updating and patching discloses a method comprising:

● receiving a package(see for example, Fig.3, item 54 and related text, "Patch

File"); and

● synthesizing a target file by applying a delta in the package to a base file to

synthesize a target file (see for example, Fig.3, items 54, 58 and related text,

also see Fig.7, "user's computer" and related text)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to use <u>Sliger</u>'s decompressing method to

decompress and generate target files from Zan's compressed file. One has

motivation to do so in order to reduce communication or storage costs as once

pointed by Zan (see for example, p.1, left column, section 1, Introduction)

Claim 14:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as in claim 13 above, Zan further disclose

the method wherein applying the delta to the base file comprises applying the

delta to a base file included in the package (see for example, p.2, left column,

lines 41-44, "compressing and uncompressing an entire collection", also see

Fig.1 and related text).

Claim 15:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as in claim 13 above. Zan also discloses the

method wherein applying the delta to the base file comprises applying the delta

to a base file synthesized from another delta and another base file (see for

example, p.3, right column, lines 1-5, "sequence for compression")

Claim 21:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as in claim 13 above. Zan also discloses the

method further comprising, applying another delta to the synthesized target file to

synthesize another target file (see for example, fig.1 and related text, also see

lines 1-5, "files 1...4").

Claim 22:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as in claim 13 above. Zan also discloses the

method further comprising, applying at least two deltas to a common base file to

synthesize at least two target files (see for example, fig.1 and related text, also

see lines 1-5, "The optimal sequence for compression is (0,1), (1,2), (1,3)").

Claim 23:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as discussed in claim 13 above. It is well

known in the computer art that said method can be practiced and stored in the

computer-readable medium. Therefore, this claim is also obvious by Zan and

Sliger.

16.   Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Zan (Zan et al, "Cluster-Based Delta Compression of a Collection of Files")

in view of Sliger (Sliger et al., US 6,216,175) and in further view of Forbes

(Forbes et al., US 6,381,742 B2).

Claim 16:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as in claim 13 above, but do not disclose

using the data file to determine to which base file each delta is to be applied.

However, Forbes in the same analogous art of software package management

discloses a manifest file (package data) to manage the installation, execution.

(see for example, Fig.2A, element 207 and related text. Also see abstract about

the manifest file). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the manifest file into

Zan and Sliger's method to provide configuration information to the software

installation. One has motivation to do so to automatically install software package

without requiring manual intervention by the user as once suggested by Forbes.

(see for example, col.3, lines 30-34, "Because the manifest file contains the

location of the distribution units for any dependencies, the software package

manager can acquire and install the dependencies without requiring manual

intervention by the user.")

Claim 17:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as in claim 14 above, but do not disclose the

method wherein the data file comprises a set of instructions including instructions

that identify a particular base file to which a particular delta file is to be applied.

However, Forbes in the same analogous art of software package management

discloses a manifest file (data file) to manage the installation, execution. (see for

example, Fig.2A, element 207 and related text. Also see abstract about the

manifest file). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to include the manifest file into Zan

and Sliger's method to provide configuration information to the software

installation. One has motivation to do so to automatically install software package

without requiring manual intervention by the user as once suggested by Forbes

(see for example, col.3, lines 30-34, "Because the manifest file contains the

location of the distribution units for any dependencies, the software package

manager can acquire and install the dependencies without requiring manual

intervention by the user.")

17.   Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Zan (Zan et al, "Cluster-Based Delta Compression of a Collection of Files") in

view of Sliger (Sliger et al., US 6,216,175) and in further view of Henry (Craig

James Henry, US 6,131,192).

Claim 18:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as in claim 13 above, but do not disclose the

method further comprising, executing a setup program. However, Henry in the

same analogous art of software installation discloses the method comprising

setting up the software product. (see for example, Fig.3, item 130, 135 and 140

and related text, "Place decompressed file in the temporary storage space",

"Begin setting up the software product"). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further execute the setup program to install files which are decompressed by Zan

and Sliger. One has been motivated to do so to simplify and streamline the

process of installing a software product on a computer as once suggested by

Henry (see for example, col.1, lines 48-50)

Claim 19:

Zan, Sliger and Henry disclose the method as in claim 18 above, Henry further

discloses the method wherein the setup program is executed after each delta has

been applied to a corresponding base file. (see for example, Fig.3, item 120, 125,

130, 135 and related text, "Place decompressed file in the temporary storage

space"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to further execute the setup program to

store files in the temporary directory which are decompressed by Zan and Sliger

and check the decompression status. One having been motivated to do so to

simplify and streamline the process of installing a software product on a

computer as once suggested by Henry (see for example, col.1, lines 48-50)

Claim 20:

Zan and Sliger disclose the method as in claim 13 above, but do not disclose the

method further comprising, deleting the deltas from a temporary directory.

However, Henry in the same analogous art of software installation discloses the

step to delete files form temporary storage space. (see for example, Fig.3, step

155, "Delete Files From temporary storage space" and related text). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to delete the deltas files in the temporary directory. One

having been motivated to do so to reduce storage costs as once suggest by Zan

(see for example, p.1, left column, section 1, Introduction)

18.   Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zan

(Zan et al, "Cluster-Based Delta Compression of a Collection of Files") in view of

Henry (Craig James Henry, US 6,131,192) and in further view of Forbes (Forbes

et al., US 6,381,742 B2).

Claim 31:

Zan and Hernry disclose the data structure of claim 30, but do not disclose the

data structure further comprising data for directing the extraction program.

However, Forbes in the same analogous art of software package management

discloses a manifest file (package data) to manage the installation, execution.

(see for example, Fig.2A, element 207 and related text. Also see abstract about

the manifest file). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the manifest file into

the software package to provide configuration information to the software

installation. One has motivation to do so to automatically install software package

without requiring manual intervention by the user. (see for example, col.3, lines

30-34, "Because the manifest file contains the location of the distribution units for

any dependencies, the software package manager can acquire and install the

dependencies without requiring manual intervention by the user.")

Conclusion

19.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

20.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zheng Wei whose telephone number is (571) 270-1059 and Fax number is (571) 270-2059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-15:00.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571- 272-1000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ZW

/Tuan Q. Dam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192